



**STATEWIDE ARTICULATION AND TRANSFER COUNCIL**  
**BoR Conference Rm • Claiborne Building • Baton Rouge, LA**  
**Thursday, 23 October 2014 • 1:00 pm**

**-- Minutes --**

**SATC:** Neil Matkin, Chair/LCTCS; Gil Reeve/LSU; Monique Winfield/SUS; Mary Ann Coleman/LAICU; Lisa French/LDE [Absent: Karla Hughes/ULS]

**GenEd Committee:** Bobbie Hatfield/LSUA; Lesa Taylor-Dupree/BPCC; Jeff Temple/SLU; Galen Turner/La Tech

**Board of Regents Staff:** Karen Denby, Jeannine Kahn

**Guests:** Senator Ben Nevers; Derrick Manns/LCTCS; Claire Norris/BoR; Donna Womack/BPCC.

Handouts: Agenda; Minutes (072414); 2014 Report to House & Senate Ed; 2013 & 2014 Report Data; SR 144 & Definition Worksheet; CLEP Survey Table (Draft)

The minutes from the 24 July meeting were approved as written.

**2014 Articulation & Transfer Report.** Karen Denby distributed copies of the 2014 report to House/Senate Education Committees (Act 623), along with a document showing just the tables from the 2013 and 2014 reports, for comparison purposes. She noted that other topics related to the whole transfer/articulation picture would be addressed in the Transfer Report requested by SR 144.

**Articulated Credit, Course Articulation, and Articulation Legislation.** Lisa Vosper gave a brief review of the 2009-10 Statewide Secondary to Postsecondary Articulation (STArt) Agreement, reminding participants that the “articulated credit” in STArt deals with technical training and pre-dates the LDE’s work on Jump Start or LCTCS’ and the LWC’s work on IBCs. She noted that it may be time to adjust or sunset articulated credit altogether as the STArt agreement is reevaluated in the near future.

Senator Nevers addressed the group to note that, based on the LCTCS representative’s briefing to the Agricultural Education Commission on 15 October, many people are still confused by what is meant by *Articulation & Transfer*, and it remains important to educate counselors and advisors as well as students and parents. He reiterated the schedule of benchmarks due by the end of the 2015-16 school year, saying that he is willing to tweak the (Chapter 25-A) legislation as needed, but he must be advised of the need. He mentioned the need for more involvement between K-12 and postsecondary educators, seeking to make better use of qualified HS teachers who would teach college courses as dual enrollment.

On behalf of SATC and GenEd, Neil Matkin offered to review Act 356 (Chapter 25-A) and suggest relevant changes by January, honoring the intent that students should not have to earn credit twice for the same work, but acknowledging that some educational silos still exist. Gil Reeve noted that “getting credit” is a confusing term if the credit is not relevant to the degree program. Maryann Coleman and Derrick Manns suggested that a method be devised to summarize all of the things that are going on around the state, including best practice examples (e.g., with a ‘score card’), to illustrate how the requirements of the law are being addressed.

**SR 144 – Statewide Transfer Study.** Neil Matkin mentioned that LCTCS would be willing to help fund a contract with NCHEMS to conduct the transfer study, but acknowledged that gathering all of the data for NCHEMS would near equivalence to conducting the study in-house. Karen Denby led the group through the 18 points of the resolution, describing what data could be accessed from campus SSPS and Completer reports and seeking input on how members would like to address various variables. The worksheet on SR 144 – Definitions/Clarifications was annotated through the discussion. Items of interests included information on dual enrollment, e.g., number of hours earned; performance upon enrollment; etc. (See atch’d.)

**Informing Students/Advisors.** Karen Denby distributed the summary tables of CLEP and AP Cut Scores for College Credit, noting that the CLEP survey is ongoing and the AP table is posted on the BoR web.

**GenEd Committee Update.** Galen Turner gave a brief summary of the GenEd Committee meeting earlier in the day, noting that working groups were formed to review LT Templates and the Guide to General Education.

The meeting concluded by 3:00pm. The next meeting will be scheduled as needed.

## SR 144 – Definitions/Clarifications

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this study shall include, at a minimum, the following:	
Pick a year (or two)... define focus, spread.	
(1) Development of a <u>broad definition</u> of transfer.	Adm Status = 4. IPEDS: stu is transfer if (1) <u>first time</u> in your school, and (2) attended college somewhere else, post HS. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Transfer <i>student</i> vs transfer <i>course</i></li> </ul>
(2) The <u>total number</u> of students who transfer.	What years? = 2010-2013
(3) The institutions students transfer to and from.	Adm status = 4 + Previous enrollment.
(4) An examination of <u>transfer patterns</u> .	2-4; 2-2; 4-2; 4-4?
(5) The demographics of transfer students.	Race, gender, Pell, dvlptl enrl, HS core, age, TOPS – what year(s)? patterns w/in demographics? Ed Level (HS diploma? Y/N)
(6) The <u>academic majors or career and technical training focus</u> of transfer students at both sending and receiving institutions.	CIP4 (easier to interpret/aggregate than CIP6)
(7) The number of academic <u>credits earned</u> by transfer students at sending and receiving institutions.	Student Level – how stu came into the transfer inst. # University transfers with Junior status. [ <i>Earned</i> (vs <i>attempted</i> ) is based a lot on inst policy (does a D count? What relates/applies to the degree program?)]
(8) Documented completion of any <u>academic awards earned</u> by students <u>prior to transfer</u> .	Highest (not individual or total) awards. (ex: see 2014 rpt: asc) [See BPCC: how do they report # grads; # awards –e.g., (x) students earned (y) awards before they transferred]
(9) The <u>academic performance</u> of transfer students at sending and receiving institutions.	Academic standing (good, probation, drop) as proxy.
(10) A <u>comparison</u> of the academic performance of transfer students to that of native students.	Academic standing (good, probation, drop) as proxy. [see TX Tech report: how students perform. May have to be done by campuses?]
(11) The success rate of transfer students at receiving institutions in terms of <u>degree or program completion</u> .	IPEDS: <i>success rate</i> is now <i>outcome measures</i> = at a point in time, either – (1) completed; (2) transferred w/ credential; (3) transferred w/o credential; (4) still enrolled. = ABCDP c/b incremental # of years

## SR 144 – Definitions/Clarifications

<p>(12) The <u>average number of credits</u> earned by transfer students who complete a bachelor's degree, as <u>compared</u> to native students who complete a bachelor's degree.</p>	<p>? How to capture credits <i>earned</i>, or even cumulative credits? Survey campus IR for given year's graduates?</p>
<p>(13) The performance of students who completed the <u>general education English</u> requirements at the sending institution, and how these students performed in writing intensive courses at the receiving institution.</p>	<p>Performance = grades? What grades? (ABC/DFWI? ABCD/FWI?) Any English. (Define 'writing intensive')</p>
<p>(14) The performance of students who completed the <u>general education math requirements</u> at the sending institution, and how these students performed in math and science courses at the receiving institution.</p>	<p><i>Performance = what?</i> Any math. (Science = ? too broad? – add BIOL, CHEM &amp; PHYS as standard sciences?)</p>
<p>(15) A listing of the most <u>commonly completed courses</u> at sending and receiving institutions.</p>	<p>SCH report. (What will this tell us?)</p>
<p>(16) Any other elements of transfer as deemed necessary by the Board of Regents in consultation with the postsecondary education management boards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Info on 'reverse transfer'</li> <li>• DE: SCH, Transfers; (where do they go; # hours @ CC; success?) [e.g., PR status, then enrl anywhere]</li> <li>• Level of education for entering students (i.e., GED, High School Diploma)</li> <li>• (See also – BoR staff questions, last row)</li> </ul>
<p>(17) A <u>comparison</u> of all statistics collected for this study regarding Louisiana's transfer activities to those of the other Southern Regional Education Board (<u>SREB</u>) states.</p>	<p>XX</p>
<p>(18) Identification of <u>obstacles</u> preventing full implementation of Act 356 of the 2009 Regular Session <u>and strategies</u> to overcome these obstacles, including any necessary legislation.</p>	
<p><u>Additional questions that might be useful.</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Investigate outcome metrics (i.e., degree awarded, graduation rates, transfer rates, time and credits to degree) by institutions, and by flagship, statewide, regional, and two-year?</li> <li>2. Investigate the relationship between student loan debt and time to completion (Not possible with current data, but perhaps NSC could help with this question)?</li> <li>3. Is taking 15 or more hours related to students' academic performance?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. How does academic performance (i.e., GPA/academic standing/gateway course success) affect time to degree?</li> <li>5. How does dual enrollment affect time to degree?</li> <li>6. How does dual enrollment affect students' academic performance (GPA, course completion) once they get on campuses?</li> <li>7. Whether and how TOPS affects the number of hours students complete each semester?</li> </ol>